



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the government at Manila. The viceroy of Mexico says the Philippines have, up to 1586, cost the King of Spain 3,000,000 pesos, and that the wily Chinese are absorbing 300,000 pesos every year, money sent out from Spain and Mexico, returning products only for them.

An editorial announcement is made of the change of title in this work, to make it cover the history of the Philippines during the nineteenth century, stopping at 1898 instead of 1803. The editors have feared principally the difficulties in the way of handling the later periods in a manner acceptable to scholars, besides considering that material on the last century in the islands is more readily accessible. The change in plan is in response to a quite general demand, and emphasizes the especial value of this work for the general public — though one can hardly denominate a fifty-five-volume series of reprints a "popular" work. The almost total lack of acceptable material on Philippine history in English gives this undertaking an immediate value which in one sense handicaps the editors, in that it has set the press going before they could possibly digest the mass of Philippine documentary material, unedited as well as edited, which must be surveyed before authoritative work can be done. Critical scholarship cannot, for some time to come, have its final say as to Philippine history.

JAMES A. LE ROY.

Die Blutzeugen aus den Tagen der Titus Oates-Verschwörung (1678-1781). Ein Beitrag zur Kirchengeschichte Englands im 17. Jahrhundert. Von JOSEPH SPILLMAN, S.J. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herderische Buchhandlung. 1901. Pp. xiii, 377.)

The Popish Plot. A Study in the History of the Reign of Charles II. By JOHN POLLOCK, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London: Duckworth and Company. 1903. Pp. xix, 419.)

BURNET in his *History* gave a valuable but brief account of the Popish Plot. Since his time historians of the period, Echard, Ralph, Oldmixon, and Hume, in the eighteenth century, and Lingard, Hallam, Macaulay, and Ranke in the nineteenth, have devoted more or less space to the subject. The material, however, is vast, out of all proportion to anything that has hitherto been written. As to conclusions reached up to the appearance of the books at present under consideration, Burnet disbelieved in the actual plot, and not only Catholic historians, but also the generality of Protestant historians have adopted the same attitude. Writers of both parties have joined hands in denouncing Oates, Bedloe, Dangerfield, and the rest of the crew as impostors, have dwelt on the contradictions and falsehoods of the witnesses, the partiality of the judges and juries, and the innocence of the victims. Where they have parted company has been in seeking to explain the origin of the panic. Those of Catholic sympathies, while not in general misrepresenting the evident facts, have omitted to take into account the designs of the papist party in England, particularly the Jesuits, and their intrigues with Rome and France, and have represented the whole thing as a deliberate fabrication

worked up by Shaftesbury and the country party, or Whigs, as they were soon called, to further their designs in breaking the order of succession and shattering the rival faith. Burnet's view is fairly typical of the opposing school. While he agreed that the Protestant party overreached itself in trying to prove a specific plot and was guilty of shedding innocent blood, he considers it quite clear that a conspiracy was on foot to change the established religion by foreign assistance. Ranke, from his unrivaled knowledge of contemporary public affairs, both in England and on the continent, was able to tell us a great deal about the political and diplomatic aspects of the plot. But, as a general historian, he painted with broad strokes; and a more special interest in the subject was needed, an intimate acquaintance with the composition and aims of English parties, and a thorough knowledge of the workings of English legal and administrative machinery, united with breadth of view and historic impartiality, to trace out the course of events in detail and group the results into a well-rounded whole.

Since the beginning of the twentieth century two monographs have been published. The first in point of time is by a German Jesuit, who, having already told the story of the English martyrs under Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, comes at length to deal with the third group, whose martyrdom in consequence of the "Titus-Oates plot" formed "den glorreichen Abschluss der blutigen Verfolgung, durch welche die anglikanische Kirche die katholische Religion in England vernichten wollte." His attitude is that of an extremist; he shows no evidence of having used any new material; and, furthermore, bases his account chiefly on the writings of those of his own faith. Rather slighting the political setting, he goes at considerable length into the charges of the informers, the careers of the accused, and the proceedings against them, not only in London, but throughout the country. Amusing instances of primitive superstition occur here and there, for instance, the account of the swelling of Charles's hand after he had signed the death-warrant of the five Jesuits (pp. 164-165) and the stories of the distressing fate of several of the informers. On the whole, however, the book is not without value, both for bringing together in a single volume material hitherto scattered in Foley's seven volumes of *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, Gillow's five-volume *Literary and Biographical History of the English Catholics*, and in less accessible works, as well as for the point of view it represents. Among other bits of information it is perhaps not generally known that by a decree of the Congregation of Rites, dated December 4, 1886, and confirmed by Leo XIII., the beatification of twenty-five victims of the plot was begun. The original list contained thirty-seven, but twelve were temporarily stricken off until more definite proofs of their martyrdom could be secured.

The second work under consideration, originally prepared as a thesis for a Cambridge fellowship, is a distinct contribution. Indeed, it is the first adequate study of the plot ever published. As to its plan and scope, Mr. Pollock informs us that when he began his study the late Lord Acton

wrote him, "There are three quite unravelled mysteries: — what was going on between Coleman and Père La Chaize; how Oates get hold of the wrong story; and who killed Godfrey." He not only answers these questions more fully and satisfactorily than they have ever been answered before, but in addition throws new lights on the politics of the plot, and, by considering them in connection with the administrative and judicial system of the period, gives us for the first time a rational account of the trials of the accused.

The first book of the four into which the study is divided deals with the disclosures of Oates and the designs of the Roman Catholics. Much new material, as well as the findings of the most recent authorities who touch at any point on the questions involved, is examined, the evidence is carefully sifted, and conclusions cautiously drawn. The workings of the elementary machinery are sufficiently exposed to enable the reader to accept or reject the results as he sees fit. Oates is pictured as a liar and impostor from the start, and — contrary to Lingard, who regarded him as the agent of Tonge, and as instigated by him to join the Roman Catholics for the purpose of making disclosures — is given the full credit for his base fabrication. He apparently joined that faith of his own accord, undoubtedly with an eye to his own advantage, but not yet anticipating the form it subsequently took. Oates's *True and Exact Narrative* was got up in collusion with Tonge after Oates's return from St. Omer; but it is difficult to determine whether the connection between the two began before or after his residence there. In spite of Oates's mendacity, the historian is not justified in asserting that his whole story was a mere figment.

The Roman Catholics had founded great hopes on the accession of Charles, but when it became evident that they could expect nothing from him, they sought to effect their purposes through his brother. Coleman, first secretary of the Duke and then of the Duchess of York, became involved in a complicated series of intrigues, during the course of which he was actively negotiating with La Chaize, the confessor of Louis XIV., and with Albani, the papal nuncio at Brussels. At one stage of the proceedings we find him seeking money from abroad to turn the rank and file of the English Parliament against Charles in the interest of France and the Roman Catholic religion. Over two hundred of his letters have been preserved, and although their meaning in individual cases is obscure, their general design is pretty clear. For the three years from 1675 to 1678 they are especially vague and infrequent. On the whole, however, the testimony is sufficient to prove that Coleman, and those with whom he was associated, were aiming by the assistance of a foreign power to "extirpate the religion established in . . . [the] country"; and even if Coleman were not guilty of the specific charges brought against him at his trial, there was still legal ground for convicting him of treason. Moreover, there can be little question that the Duke of York was privy to his designs. Partly from the fragments of Coleman's later correspondence and partly from other sources, the author concludes that there was

some sort of a scheme on foot in 1678, and that it was in some way directed against the King. A new and valuable bit of evidence is the death-bed confession of Lord Berkshire to one Colonel Scott. If Scott's story can be relied upon, and Mr. Pollock thinks it can, the government certainly were justified in committing Arundell, Bellasis, Powis, Stafford, and Petre. "According to the information which Lord Berkshire gave to Colonel Scott," to quote the conclusion of this part of the survey, "no harm was intended to the King, at least he knew of none. This may well have been, but at the same time it is necessary to remember that Charles was at the moment the greatest impediment to the chance of Catholic success. He was little older than his brother, and enjoyed far better health. As far as could be judged, he was by no means likely to be the first to die. He had definitely adopted a policy adverse to the Catholics. If he were to die, the charge of revolutionary dealing would lie at the door of those who should attempt to keep the Duke of York from the throne. So long as Charles lived, any attempt to restore the Roman Catholic religion in England, certainly any attempt made behind his back, would be a matter of high treason and against the interests of peace and established order. This much only can be said with safety, that the brothers hated each other, that the death of the King was talked in the Jesuit seminaries on the continent, and that James was not above tolerating, if he did not direct, an attempt to murder the husband of his daughter" (p. 69). In view of these facts, "Oates was not after all aiming shafts utterly at random. During his stay in the Jesuit seminaries in Spain and Flanders he must have obtained an inkling of what was in the air, and proceeded to act upon the information to his best advantage. That the whole truth had little resemblance to his tale of fire and massacre is certain, but the tale was not wholly devoid of truth. His vast superstructure of lies was not without a slight basis of solid fact" (p. 64).

While it was still uncertain whether Oates's wild stories would be accepted, Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, the magistrate who took his depositions, was found dead on Primrose Hill. How he met his death is one of the great puzzles of history, and all sorts of conjectures have been hazarded. Following Gardiner's lead in dealing with the Gunpowder Plot, Mr. Pollock, after examining and testing all the facts, has tried one key after another until he has succeeded, to his satisfaction, in opening the lock. The conclusion at which he arrives after remarkably close and ingenious reasoning is that Godfrey must have learned from Coleman that the Jesuits had held their provincial meeting of April 24, 1678, not at the White Horse Tavern, as Oates had deposed, but at St. James's Palace, and that certain Jesuits — Le Fevre, Welch, and Pritchard — murdered the justice of the peace to prevent the possible disclosure of a secret that would have ruined the Duke of York and the party depending on him. Prance was involved. Bedloe got wind of the fact and accused him. To divert attention from the guilty parties Prance charged the crime on three men who were really innocent. In the opinion of the author, Green, Berry, and Hill were wrongfully put to death, although

in view of the evidence presented at the trial the sentence of the court was justified. This explanation of Godfrey's murder fits the facts better than any hitherto advanced ; nevertheless one must bear in mind that no certain proof exists of Coleman's imparting to Godfrey the secret in question.

The murder gave the Protestant opposition the very chance they wanted. We cannot enter here into the objects of the conflicting parties, so carefully treated by the author in his third book. While doing full justice to Shaftesbury's aims to advance " religious and political freedom and commercial enterprise," Mr. Pollock justly emphasizes the disreputable means by which he sought to achieve his purpose. He shatters with a final blow the view held by some hostile historians that Shaftesbury invented the plot, but he makes it evident, if any further proof were needed, that Shaftesbury welcomed Oates and turned the latter's disclosures to his own advantage. He even prompted the charges against the Queen in order to bring about a divorce and a Protestant marriage ; and only when that scheme failed did he throw his support in favor of the Duke of Monmouth. The Green Ribbon Club, an organization founded in 1675, whose influence has not been adequately recognized, was very active in furthering Shaftesbury's political plans. In this part of the work great obligations are acknowledged to Sir George Sitwell's *First Whig*. Christie, Shaftesbury's classic biographer and apologist — to whom, by the way, Mr. Pollock never directly refers in his text — argues that the great opposition leader was as sincere as Russell in believing that a conspiracy existed against the King, the nation, and the Protestant religion. But he insults the intelligence of an extraordinarily able man if he means to imply that Shaftesbury believed Oates's absurd stories ; and certainly Shaftesbury employed means discreditable even for that day to instigate and substantiate the specific disclosures of the informers.

In treating the actual trials the author points out certain considerations which, strangely enough, have never been taken into account in this connection. England, during at least eight reigns following the Reformation, was continually in an unsettled state, subject to attack from without, and to disturbance and even revolution from within ; there was no standing army, no police system ; and the responsibility for keeping order, for the detection and punishment of crime, was in the hands of the justices of the peace and the judges. In view of these facts, we can readily understand the attitude of the courts and judges, who took every possible means to secure the conviction of a prisoner suspected of disturbing the peace, or, still worse, of conspiracy against the government. Moreover, the extremely defective system of legal procedure prevailing in those days worked to the prejudice of the accused. All this is brought before the reader in great detail, fortified by ample illustrations from works like Stephen's *History of the Criminal Law in England*, and Gardiner's *History of England*, and from the *State Trials* themselves, to show that the case of the Popish Plot presents no ghastly anomaly in the judicial procedure of the time. Even the much-condemned Scroggs does

not compare at all unfavorably, in point of fairness, with that stanch bulwark of the common law, Sir Edward Coke, for instance.

To sum up the results of Mr. Pollock's scholarly study: While emphasizing sufficiently the mendacity of the informers and the unscrupulous use that the party leaders made of their disclosures, he has shown us just what Protestants had to fear and why the panic was possible, and has estimated the trials of the accused in their true setting. Actual errors of fact or statement are remarkably few. Father Pollen, in a note to the *Athenaeum* for July 18, points out that his attack on Gavan (p. 201) is not substantiated from the evidence cited, and that by unintentionally misreading a sentence he has confused the Jesuit father with the coachman of the imperial ambassador. Occasional slips in proof-reading occur. The reference to Pepys's *Diary* (p. 88) should be 1669 not 1699; Oates's second deposition consisted apparently of 81 not 83 articles (p. 90); Baron Flowerdue was raised to the bench in 1584 not 1684 (p. 277, note 3); and in the abstract of the penal laws the two dated 1603 and 1609 (pp. 402, 403) were passed in 1604 and 1610 respectively, although in each case Parliament met before the close of the former year, according to the old style.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

The Cambridge Modern History. Planned by the late LORD ACTON, LL.D., Regius Professor of Modern History. Edited by A. W. WARD, Litt.D., G. W. PROTHERO, Litt.D., and STANLEY LEATHES, M.A. Vol. VII. The United States. (London: Macmillan and Company; New York: The Macmillan Co. 1903. Pp. xxvii, 857.)

COMPOSITE histories, the work of various hands, are now a familiar type, of which every country has its examples. They are hard to review within reasonable bounds, for the work of the editors and of each of the writers demands separate consideration before one can arrive at a just judgment of the whole. The present volume contains twenty-three chapters, by thirteen different writers; little can be said in detail of each.

The work of the editors, which on the whole has been performed less satisfactorily than that of the contributors, deserves some indulgence on account of the difficulties which must have been occasioned by Lord Acton's illness and death, and the attendant confusion of plans; however, there was no compulsion to publish at a specified time. The task of the editors of such a book is, no doubt, to devise the chapters, fix their respective limits and lengths, select the writers, impart a common ideal of treatment, revise the texts, give uniformity and completeness to the bibliographies, and supply the index. The mechanical execution was already in good hands. Lord Acton's general plan for the volume was that, finding its place in his series near the end of the eighteenth century, it should recount the whole history of the English in America and of the United States from the beginning to the present time. This followed from his general principle of arrangement, that the history of each people